

Serial No. 10/690,629
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Docket No. GCTS-0036

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 12, 18- 20 and 22-24 are amended and claim 25 is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments or the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Office Action's indication that claims 1-17 define patentable subject matter. However, for at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims define patentable subject matter.

A. The Office Action objects to claims 1-24 for informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments obviate the grounds for the objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendment obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 18- 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

C. The Office Action rejects claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) over US Publication No. 2003/0161421 to Schmidt et al. (hereafter "Schmidt"). Since Schmidt fails to disclose or suggest features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least features of a receiver including a first feedback canceler to cancel postcursor- inter-symbol interference (ISI) caused by a preceding symbol, a second feedback canceler to cancel precursor-ISI caused by a trailing symbol, wherein the first and second feedback cancellers use a same set of decision feedback equalizer (DFE) coefficients to cancel the postcursor-ISI and precursor-ISI and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23 are not disclosed or suggested Schmidt.

Schmidt discloses a feedback filter (240) for reducing postcursor interference in the CCK-11 modulated signal. Further, the feedback filter is activated only when the rate is determined to be 11 Mbps. See paragraph [0036] of Schmidt. In contrast to recited features, Schmidt does not disclose feeding back information for reducing precursor interference, but

Serial No. 10/690,629

Docket No. GCTS-0036

Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

instead determines feedforward filter coefficients based on the channel impulse response. See paragraphs [0030] and [0032]-[0034] of Schmidt. Namely, Schmidt discloses feedforward filter 220 to reduce precursor interference in a DFE unit with the feedback filter 240 selectively used to reduce postcursor interference. See Fig. 2 and claims 1, 13 and 31-32 of Schmidt, for example. Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that Schmidt discloses element 220 to be a QPSK dc/remodulator to pass a delayed signal to the feedback filter 240. See paragraph [0023] of Schmidt.

Applicants respectfully submit that Schmidt does not teach or suggest the feedforward filter 220 and the feedback filter 240 use the same set of coefficients. See Figs. 2-4 of Schmidt. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Schmidt does not teach or suggest any modification to their disclosure that would result in at least the features of a first and second feedback cancelers and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23.

With respect to claim 24, Applicants note the February 21, 2007 Office Action admitted Schmidt does not teach or suggest features of computing a chip-time reversed estimate of the current CCK codeword and canceling precursor-ISI from a previous CCK codeword based on the chip-time reversed estimate of the current CCK codeword (in discussing claim 1).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 defines patentable subject matter. Claim 22 defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 23. Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and therefore also defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as its additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

D. Claim 25 is newly added by this Amendment and believed to be in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 10/690,629
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

Docket No. GCTS-0036

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Carl Wesolowski, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-4235 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
THE FLESHNER GROUP, PLLC



Carl R. Wesolowski, Esq.
Registration No. 40,372
René A. Vazquez
Registration No. 38,647

P.O. Box 1397
Ashburn, Virginia 20146-9998
703 766-3701 RAV/CRW/ldh
Date: FEBRUARY 11, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 68733